



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,383	02/12/2001	Karel Elbert Kuijk	NL 000045	1640

24737 7590 11/04/2003

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/781,383

Applicant(s)

KUIJK, KAREL ELBERT

Examiner

Jeff Piziali

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 22 August 2003 has been entered.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Newly amended (see Paper No. 11, filed 22 August 2003) independent claims 1 and 9 both for the first time recite the limitation that one pulse has a first **nonzero** polarity which opposes a second **nonzero** polarity of the other pulses. However, respective dependent claims 6

Art Unit: 2673

and 14 each recite the seemingly conflicting inventive limitation of orthogonal signals free from a DC voltage. With a "DC voltage" commonly defined in the art as meaning a constant level of voltage over a period of time, it would be unclear to one skilled in the art how a signal could exist in a nonzero state while simultaneously remaining free of any DC voltage. The applicant is directed to note that an action (Paper No. 8, mailed 22 May 2003) on the merits for the originally presented invention (i.e. signals free of a DC voltage) has already been provided. An examination of the instant invention -- including all presently pending claims -- follows below as a good faith effort, done to the best of the examiner's understanding of the claimed invention. However, a response is required to the grounds of this rejection.

6. All remaining claims (2-5, 7, 8, 10-13, and 15-18) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph due to their respective dependencies upon rejected base claims 1, 6, 9, and 14 (see above paragraph).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimura et al. (US 5,677,705).

Regarding claim 1, Shimura discloses a display device [Fig. 1, 32] comprising a liquid crystal between a first substrate provided with row/selection electrodes [Fig. 1, 29-31] and a

Art Unit: 2673

second substrate provided with column/data electrodes [Fig. 1, 23-25], the row electrodes and the column electrodes overlapping to define pixels; column drive means [Fig. 1, 22] for driving the column electrodes in conformity with an image to be displayed; and row drive means [Fig. 1, 28] for driving the row electrodes which, in the operating condition, sequentially supply groups of p row electrodes with p mutually orthogonal signals [Fig. 5, $\phi(1) - \phi(8)$], wherein the mutually orthogonal signals are obtained from at least two types of orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time [Fig. 5, t], within which four elementary units of time one pulse each time has a first nonzero (i.e. 1, for instance) polarity which opposes a second nonzero (i.e. -1, for instance) polarity of the other pulses (see Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 2, Shimura discloses the orthogonal signals are obtained from orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time, within which four elementary units of time the one pulse having the first nonzero (i.e. 1, for instance) polarity which opposes the second nonzero (i.e. -1, for instance) polarity of the other pulses each time shifts by one elementary unit of time (see Fig. 5; Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 3, Shimura discloses the orthogonal signals are obtained from orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time which, viewed in a time sequence, are situated one after the other (see Fig. 5; Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 4, Shimura discloses at least two orthogonal signals have opposed DC contents (see Fig. 5; Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 5, Shimura discloses the orthogonal signals are obtained from orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time, in which the elementary units of the orthogonal functions are interwoven (see Fig. 5; Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 6, Shimura discloses $p=4$, and in that four orthogonal signals have identical DC contents and four are free from a DC voltage (see Fig. 5; Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 7, Shimura discloses the DC content of 2 orthogonal signals of the orthogonal signals having an identical DC content is opposed to that of the two other orthogonal signals (see Fig. 5; Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 9, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 3.

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding claim 12, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claim 13, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 6.

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 7.

Regarding claim 17, Shimura discloses the first nonzero polarity is a negative polarity (i.e. -1, for instance); and the second nonzero polarity is a positive polarity (i.e. 1, for instance) (see Fig. 5; Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60).

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2673

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimura et al. (US 5,677,705) in view of Ito et al. (US 6,252,573).

Regarding claim 8, Shimura does not expressly disclose that the row drive means inverts the orthogonal signals after each frame period. However, Ito does disclose inverting orthogonal row signals after each frame period (see Figs. 8A-D; Column 17, Lines 1-65). Shimura and Ito are analogous art because they are from the shared field of LCD device driving methods. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use Ito's per-frame inversion technique with Shimura's display device, so as to maintain display brightness and prevent a reduction in contrast.

Regarding claim 16, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in the above rejection of claim 8.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 22 August 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant contends the cited prior art of Shimura et al. (US 5,677,705) fails to teach that the mutually orthogonal signals are obtained from at least two types of orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time, within which four elementary units of time one pulse each time has a first polarity which opposes a second polarity of the other pulses.

However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Shimura discloses the mutually orthogonal

"Art Unit: 2673

signals [Fig. 5, $\emptyset(1)$ - $\emptyset(8)$], wherein the mutually orthogonal signals are obtained from at least two types of orthogonal functions having four elementary units of time [Fig. 5, t], within which four elementary units of time one pulse each time has a first nonzero (i.e. 1, for instance) polarity which opposes a second nonzero (i.e. -1, for instance) polarity of the other pulses (see Column 1, Line 39 - Column 5, Line 60). By such reasoning, rejection of the claims is deemed necessary, proper, and thereby maintained at this time.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8382. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.



J.P.

30 October 2003



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2C00